

IMAC-QA Subcommittee
July 28, 2003
Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Marcia Williamson, DHFS/DHCF/BI MA/QA, Pam Lohaus, DHFS/OSF/AA-SRO, Vicki Jessup, DHFS/DHCF/BI MA, Kathy Judd, Dane Co., Chris Elms, Dane Co., Jackie Bennett, Racine Co., Jacaie Coutant, Milwaukee Co., Gloria Guitan, Milwaukee Co., Marilyn Rudd, DHFS/DHCF/BI MA/PEU, Lisa Hanson, DHFS, John Haine, DHFS, Jennifer Bach, DWD/PACU

Attendees by phone

Joanne Ator, Door Co., and Lorie Mueller, LaCrosse Co.

Minutes from 6/14/03 Meeting

The minutes were reviewed and approved.

Status of QA Subcommittee Performance Standard Recommendations

- The QA Subcommittee recommendations have been posted to IMAC Web on the Supplemental Information Link.
- The QA Subcommittee recommendations on performance standards were discussed at the last IMAC committee meeting. Some members thought the recommendation was confusing but they did agree to pass it on to the WCHSA Committee.
- It is hoped that WCHSA will use it for the contract negotiations with the State. In all likelihood the plan may be set on for the year 2004, actually this would not be appropriate since the bonuses are available even though the penalties will not be imposed for that year.
- The recommendation will be examined at the next WCHSA meeting, on September 18th. The QA subcommittee should have representation to answer any questions the WCHSA group may have. John will contact a county person if it confirmed that this topic is a WCHSA agenda item. Our minutes from February, March and April will have all of the background information on how our recommendations were developed.

Benefit Recovery Discussion

- A discussion was held as to whether or not a performance standard should be set for benefit recoveries. To the State's knowledge there are not any standards but the FED's do select cases for a sample to review so there must be some form of expectations.
- Marilyn Rudd presented a spreadsheet that she prepared which projected monies each county could earn based on a five-year summary of agency errors rates and the 15% agency retention of recovered claims. Agency error and under issuances were removed from the calculations. Bottom line it is to the county's benefit to process as many claims as possible.
- There was some thought that some general language to encourage benefit recoveries be placed in the 2004 contract. In reality there must be a methodology established which defines the benefit recovery expectations before there can be any contract language. There is an ad hoc benefit recovery committee who is charged with establishing the standards. Since the QA committee does not have this charge however we can promote the importance of benefit recoveries and collections.
- Selected committee members will draft a memo for FS/MA programs for the next (September) meeting which will discuss the importance of collections in lieu of the ad hoc committees' work. The ad hoc benefit recovery committee will also review this memo.
- There will be a new EOS report about the number of claims beginning in August.

QAP vs Second Party Review

- There was a discussion regarding the continued need for Quality Assurance Plans. The 2nd party review process is the primary activity in the majority of the County's plans so why shouldn't the State do away with the QAP requirement and just have the 2nd party review system.
- County feedback was that there was a need to have the flexibility of a QAP, 2nd party reviews may not address the County's quality assurance needs. The County representation wanted the QAP process to continue rather than just a State mandated 2nd party review process.

Next meeting will be 9/22/03. Bernadette Conolly will take minutes.

